MSG MSG

$1 400

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JESSICA SLIVAK, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff(s) v. AMERICAN BREAD COMPANY, LLC Defendant	Case No. 16 6294 CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Jury Trial Demanded

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Jessica Slivak ("Plaintiff" or "Slivak"), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff Slivak is an "individual with a disability" as that term is understood pursuant to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*, (the "ADA") and its implementing regulations.

2. Plaintiff Slivak was born with *osteogenesis imperfecta* (aka brittle bone disease), which requires her to use a wheelchair on a daily basis.

3. Indeed, for mobility, Plaintiff Slivak has used a wheelchair for her entire adult life. Further, Plaintiff maintains a specially modified mini-van with an automatic side-ramp, allowing Plaintiff to wheel herself in and out of her vehicle, so as to permit her to travel independently. Naturally, this vehicle is registered as a handicap vehicle with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Transportation and consequently, bears a handicap license plate.

4. Because of her vehicle's sideramp, Plaintiff requires the use of handicap parking spaces in order to provide her with sufficient space for access to and from her motor vehicle.

5. Plaintiff has patronized Defendants' facilities in the past, and will continue to do so in the future.

6. As set forth below, Plaintiff was denied full access to Defendants' facilities due to its non-compliance with the ADA. As set forth below, Defendant has failed to comply with the ADA's regulations regarding handicap parking. As such, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the ADA and its implementing regulations.

7. Unless Defendant corrects the access barriers detailed herein, Plaintiff will be denied safe and full access to Defendants' facilities.

8. The ADA permits private individuals, such as Plaintiff, to bring suit in federal court so as to compel compliance with the ADA.

9. Accordingly, and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals, Plaintiff seeks: (i) a declaration that Defendants' facilities violate federal law as described; and (ii) an injunction requiring Defendant to remove the identified access barriers so that they are fully accessible to, and independently usable by, physically-impaired individuals such as Plaintiff and the class she seeks to represent.

10. Plaintiff also requests that once Defendant is fully in compliance with the requirements of the ADA, the Court retain jurisdiction for a period of time to be determined to ensure that Defendant has adopted and is following an institutional policy that will, in fact, cause Defendant to remain in compliance with the law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over the ADA claims asserted herein

pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.

12. Plaintiff's claims asserted herein arose in this judicial district and Defendant does substantial business in this judicial district.

13. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred.

PARTIES

14. Plaintiff Jessica Slivak ("Plaintiff" or "Slivak") is and, at all times relevant hereto, was a resident of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Plaintiff Slivak is and, at all times relevant hereto, has been a legally handicapped individual, and is therefore a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2) and the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 *et seq.*

15. Defendant American Bread Company, LLC ("American Bread") is a business incorporated in the state of Ohio, with principal offices located at 8905 Lake Avenue, Lakewood, Ohio 44102. American Bread is one of the nation's largest franchisees of Panera Bread Bakery Cafes ("Panera"), including one located at 151 East Swedesford Road, Exton, PA 19341.

TITLE III OF THE ADA

16. On July 26, 1990, President George H.W. Bush signed into law the ADA, a comprehensive civil rights law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability.

17. The ADA broadly protects the rights of individuals with disabilities with respect to employment, access to State and local government services, places of public accommodation, transportation, and other important areas of American life.

18. Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination in the activities of places of public

accommodation and requires places of public accommodation to comply with ADA standards and to be readily accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181-89.

19. On July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice ("DOJ") issued rules implementing Title III of the ADA, which are codified at 28 CFR Part 36.[1]

20. Appendix A of the 1991 Title III regulations (republished as Appendix D to 28 CFR part 36) contains the ADA standards for Accessible Design ("1991 Standards"), which were based upon the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines ("1991 ADAAG") published by the Access Board on the same date.[2]

21. The ADA requires removal of existing architectural barriers in facilities existing before January 26, 1992 where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181(9), 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 28 CFR 36.304(a).

22. Facilities newly built or altered after January 26, 1993 must be readily accessible and usable by disabled individuals, including individuals who use wheelchairs. 28 CFR 36.401 and 28 CFR 36.402.

23. The DOJ revised the 1991 ADAAG when it issued The 2010 Standards for Accessible Design ("2010 Standards"), which were published on September 15, 2010.

---

[1] The DOJ is the administrative agency charged by Congress with implementing the requirements of the ADA.

[2] The Access Board was established by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 29 U.S.C. § 792. The passage of the ADA expanded the Access Board's responsibilities. The ADA requires the Access Board to "issue minimum guidelines . . . to ensure that buildings, facilities, rail passenger cars, and vehicles are accessible, in terms of architecture and design, transportation, and communication, to individuals with disabilities." 42 U.S.C. § 12204. The ADA requires the DOJ to issue regulations that include enforceable accessibility standards applicable to facilities subject to Title III that are consistent with the "minimum guidelines" issued by the Access Board, 42 U.S.C. § 12134(c), 12186(c).

24. Notably, many of the requirements with respect to parking remained the same in the 2010 Standards.

25. As set forth below, Defendant has failed to comply with those requirements.

VIOLATIONS AT ISSUE

26. Defendant owns, operates, and/or leases a place of public accommodation.

27. Defendant's facilities are not fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities.

28. On or about March 14, 2015, Plaintiff Slivak visited the Defendant's facilities located at 151 East Swedesford Road, Exton, PA 19341 (the "Exton Location").

29. The Exton Location is within Plaintiff's regular area of travel. She has patronized this location in the past and intends to do so again in the future.

30. During one or more of her recent visits, Plaintiff experienced difficulty and unnecessary risk due to the existence of architectural barriers that impeded her access to, and ability to use, Defendant's facilities.

31. Specifically, no parking spaces in Defendants' parking area were designated "van accessible" as required by the ADA.

32. Section 208.2.4 of the 2010 Standards requires "at least one" van accessible designated parking space for every six accessible parking spaces a facility maintains.

33. Additionally, the purportedly accessible parking spaces contained signs that state "5 Minute Parking."

34. As a result of Defendants' failure to provide "van accessible" spaces as required by the ADA, Plaintiff cannot safely lower her van's ramp, which is her only means of entry and exit from her vehicle.

35. Importantly, upon information and belief, the Exton Location is a fairly new facility, having been built after January 1993.

36. The Exton Location is within the geographic zone that Plaintiff typically travels as part of her routine activities.

37. Accordingly, Plaintiff Slivak will continue to regularly visit the Exton Location in the future as part of her regular activities.

38. Upon information and belief, Defendants have centralized policies regarding the management and operation of its facilities, and those policies are inadequate to ensure compliance with the ADA, as is demonstrated by the fact that the Exton Location remains non-compliant.

39. Plaintiff will continue to attempt to access Defendant's Exton Location. However, so long as the Exton location continues to violate the ADA, Plaintiff will be unable to use it independently and will be, thereby, denied full access to Defendants' facilities.

40. Unfortunately, based on counsel's investigation, Defendant's failure to comply with the ADA does not appear to be an isolated issue.

41. Further investigation has disclosed additional Panera locations owned by Defendant which are not ADA-compliant.

42. Specifically, the Panera restaurant located at 267 E. Swedesford Road, Wayne, PA does not a have a parking space designated "van accessible."

43. Moreover, the sign designating the space as van accessible is not at least 60 inches above ground level.

44. Further, the Panera restaurant located at 150 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA does not a have a parking space designated "van accessible."

45. The surfaces of one or more purportedly accessible parking spaces at 150 Allendale Road had slopes exceeding 1:48 (i.e., 2.1%).

46. Finally, the Panera restaurant located at 319 East Lancaster Ave, Radnor, PA does not a have a parking space designated "van accessible."

47. Plaintiff requests periodic monitoring to confirm that the public accommodations are brought into compliance and remain in compliance.

48. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff will continue to be unable to independently use Defendants' facilities.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

49. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Rules 23(a) and 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of herself and all individuals with disabilities who have attempted to access, or will attempt to access Defendants' facilities (the "Class").

50. Upon information and belief, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all individual members in one action would be impracticable. The disposition of the individual claims of the respective Class members through this class action will benefit both the parties and this Court.

51. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class. The claims of the Plaintiff and members of the Class are based on the same legal theories and arise from the same unlawful conduct.

52. Common Questions of Fact and Law: There is a well-defined community of interest and common questions of fact and law affecting members of the Class in that they all have been and/or are being denied their civil rights to full and equal access to, and use and enjoyment of, Defendants' facilities and/or services due to Defendants' failure to make its

facilities fully accessible and independently usable as above described.

53. The questions of fact and law common to the class include but are not limited to the following:

a. Whether Defendant is a "public accommodation" under the ADA;

b. Whether Defendants' conduct in failing to make its facilities fully accessible and independently usable as described above violated the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.; and

c. Whether Plaintiff and members of the class are entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief.

54. Adequacy of Representation: Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class because her interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly, adequately, and vigorously represent and protect the interests of the members of the class and have no interests antagonistic to the members of the class. Plaintiff has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in the prosecution of class action litigation.

55. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, making appropriate both declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Plaintiff and the Class as a whole.

COUNT I
VIOLATION OF THE ADA

56. The allegations contained in the previous paragraphs are incorporated by reference.

57. Defendants' facilities at the Exton Location were required to be altered, designed, or constructed so that they are readily accessible and usable by disabled individuals, including

individuals who use wheelchairs. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1).

58. The architectural barriers described above demonstrate that Defendants' facilities were not altered, designed, or constructed in a manner that causes them to be readily accessible to and usable by individuals who use wheelchairs, including Plaintiff and the class she seeks to represent.

59. The architectural barriers described above demonstrate that Defendant has failed to remove barriers, as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

60. Defendants' facilities are required to comply with the Department of Justice's 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, or in some cases the 1991 Standards 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 36.406; 28 C.F.R., pt. 36, app. A.

61. Defendant is required to provide individuals who use wheelchairs full and equal enjoyment of its facilities. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

62. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and the Class in that it has failed to make its Exton Location fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals who use wheelchairs in violation of the ADA, as described above.

63. Defendants' conduct is ongoing, and, given that Defendant has not complied with the ADA's requirements that public accommodations be fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities, Plaintiff invokes her statutory right to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

64. Without the requested injunctive relief, specifically including the request that the Court retain jurisdiction of this matter for a period to be determined after the Defendant certifies that it is fully in compliance with the mandatory requirements of the ADA that are discussed above, Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA's requirements that its facilities be accessible

to, and independently usable, by individuals with disabilities is likely to recur.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the members of the Class, pray for:

a. A Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA described above;

b. A permanent injunction which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its facilities into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the ADA, and its implementing regulations, and which further directs that the Court shall retain jurisdiction for a period to be determined after Defendant certifies that all of its facilities are fully in compliance with the relevant requirements of the ADA to ensure that Defendant has adopted and is following an institutional policy that will in fact cause Defendant to remain in compliance with the law;

c. An Order certifying the Class proposed by Plaintiff, and naming Plaintiff as the class representative and appointing her counsel as class counsel;

d. Payment of costs of suit;

e. Payment of reasonable attorneys' fees; and,

f. The provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and appropriate.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff Slivak hereby requests a jury on all issues so triable.

(SIGNATURE ON THE NEXT PAGE)

Date: December 3, 2016

Respectfully submitted,
KALIKHMAN & RAYZ, LLC

Arkady "Eric" Rayz
Demetri A. Braynin
1051 County Line Road, Suite "A"
Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006
Telephone: (215) 364-5030
Facsimile: (215) 364-5029
E-mail: erayz@kalraylaw.com
E-mail: dbraynin@kalraylaw.com

CONNOLLY WELLS & GRAY, LLP
Gerald D. Wells, III
Stephen E. Connolly
2200 Renaissance Boulevard, Suite 308
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19046
Telephone: (610) 822-3700
Facsimile: (610) 822-3800
gwells@cwg-law.com
sconnolly@cwg-law.com

Counsel for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

JS 44 (Rev. 12/07) MSG

CIVIL COVER SHEET

16-CV-6294

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Jessica Slivak, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff: Philadelphia, PA
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Kalikhman & Rayz, LLC 1051 County Line Road, Suite "A"
Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006 (215) 364-5030

DEFENDANTS

16 6294

AMERICAN BREAD COMPANY, LLC

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant: Lakewood, Ohio
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☒ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
(For Diversity Cases Only)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	☐ 1	☐ 1	Incorporated *or* Principal Place of Business In This State	☐ 4	☐ 4
Citizen of Another State	☐ 2	☐ 2	Incorporated *and* Principal Place of Business In Another State	☐ 5	☐ 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT
- ☐ 110 Insurance
- ☐ 120 Marine
- ☐ 130 Miller Act
- ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument
- ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment
- ☐ 151 Medicare Act
- ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)
- ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits
- ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits
- ☐ 190 Other Contract
- ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability
- ☐ 196 Franchise

REAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 210 Land Condemnation
- ☐ 220 Foreclosure
- ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment
- ☐ 240 Torts to Land
- ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability
- ☐ 290 All Other Real Property

TORTS

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 310 Airplane
- ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability
- ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander
- ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability
- ☐ 340 Marine
- ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability
- ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle
- ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability
- ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice
- ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability
- ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability

PERSONAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 370 Other Fraud
- ☐ 371 Truth in Lending
- ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage
- ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability

CIVIL RIGHTS
- ☐ 441 Voting
- ☐ 442 Employment
- ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations
- ☐ 444 Welfare
- ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment
- ☒ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other
- ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights

PRISONER PETITIONS
- ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence

Habeas Corpus:
- ☐ 530 General
- ☐ 535 Death Penalty
- ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other
- ☐ 550 Civil Rights
- ☐ 555 Prison Condition

FORFEITURE/PENALTY
- ☐ 610 Agriculture
- ☐ 620 Other Food & Drug
- ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881
- ☐ 630 Liquor Laws
- ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck
- ☐ 650 Airline Regs.
- ☐ 660 Occupational Safety/Health
- ☐ 690 Other

LABOR
- ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act
- ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations
- ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act
- ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act
- ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation
- ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act

IMMIGRATION
- ☐ 462 Naturalization Application
- ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee
- ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions

BANKRUPTCY
- ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158
- ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157

PROPERTY RIGHTS
- ☐ 820 Copyrights
- ☐ 830 Patent
- ☐ 840 Trademark

SOCIAL SECURITY
- ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)
- ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)
- ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))
- ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI
- ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))

FEDERAL TAX SUITS
- ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)
- ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609

OTHER STATUTES
- ☐ 400 State Reapportionment
- ☐ 410 Antitrust
- ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
- ☐ 450 Commerce
- ☐ 460 Deportation
- ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
- ☐ 480 Consumer Credit
- ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
- ☐ 810 Selective Service
- ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
- ☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410
- ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
- ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
- ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
- ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
- ☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act
- ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act
- ☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice
- ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding
- ☐ 2 Removed from State Court
- ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
- ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened
- ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify)
- ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation
- ☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing **(Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity)**:
42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.

Brief description of cause:
Violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☑ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

DEMAND $

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: ☑ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE ______ DOCKET NUMBER ______

DATE 12/3/16

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

DEC -5 2016

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # ______ AMOUNT ______ APPLYING IFP ______ JUDGE ______ MAG. JUDGE ______

S.T.

MSG

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

SLIVAK : CIVIL ACTION

v. :

AMERICAN BREAD COMPANY, LLC : NO. 16 6294

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ( )

(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( )

(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ( )

(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ( )

(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) (x)

(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. ( )

12/3/16		Plaintiff
Date	**Attorney-at-law**	**Attorney for**
(215) 364-5030	(215) 364-5029	erayz@kalraylaw.com
Telephone	**FAX Number**	**E-Mail Address**

(Civ. 660) 10/02

DEC -5 2016

MSG UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 16 6294

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: c/o Kalikhman & Rayz, LLC 1051 County Line Rd., Suite "A" Huntingdon Valley, PA

Address of Defendant: 8905 Lake Avenue, Lakewood, Ohio 44102

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Eastern District of Pennsylvania

(*Use Reverse Side For Additional Space*)

Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?

(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Yes☐ No☒

Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? Yes☐ No☒

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:

Case Number: ____________ Judge ____________ Date Terminated: ____________

Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:

1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?
   Yes☐ No☐
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?
   Yes☐ No☐
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes☐ No☐
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?
   Yes☐ No☐

CIVIL: (Place ✔ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)

A. *Federal Question Cases:*

1. ☐ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
2. ☐ FELA
3. ☐ Jones Act-Personal Injury
4. ☐ Antitrust
5. ☐ Patent
6. ☐ Labor-Management Relations
7. ☐ Civil Rights
8. ☐ Habeas Corpus
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases
10. ☐ Social Security Review Cases
11. ☒ All other Federal Question Cases
    (Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.

B. *Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:*

1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. ☐ Airplane Personal Injury
3. ☐ Assault, Defamation
4. ☐ Marine Personal Injury
5. ☐ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. ☐ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. ☐ Products Liability
8. ☐ Products Liability — Asbestos
9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases
   (Please specify)

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION

(*Check Appropriate Category*)

I, Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq., counsel of record do hereby certify:

☒ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of $150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;

☒ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 12/3/2016 ____________ 87976

Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DEC -5 2016

DATE: 12/3/2016 ____________ 87976

Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)